

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 25, 1860.

NO. 41.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODRILL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON R. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

—Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

WAY-MARKS IN THE MORAL WAR WITH SLAVERY.

BY REV. HENRY T. CHEREVER.

NO. XVI.

A REVIEW OF THE LATE POLICY OF ASSOCIATIONS AND ASSEMBLIES IN REGARD TO FELLOWSHIP WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

The position of the Congregational Ministry and Churches of New England, at the present time, in reference to slavery, and to the adoption of any united and earnest movement for its abolition,—so far as it is to be gathered from the action or non-action of the recent State Associations and Conferences,—verifies, conclusively, what we had reason to say, two years ago, that hitherto the Church of God in America, is far from having fulfilled its mission in the matter of slavery. It has had a work to do, in the overthrow of that dreadful iniquity, which it has shamefully ignored and neglected. How keen the satire of Humboldt, in view of the relation of Christian proprietors in America to slavery, and in view of the fact that the reigning religious sects, both harbor slavery in their bosoms, and receive to their churches, pulpits, and communion tables, those who practice it.

"In our days," said Humboldt, "it is philosophers, and not devotees, who raise the question, 'Is it right to hold slaves?' But the broader range which philosophy has always had, makes me believe it would have been better for suffering humanity, if this sort of skepticism had been preserved among the believers."

Infidelity would almost seem to be changing sides. In the guilty silence of churches and ministers upon the crying sin of the age, the very oracles of orthodoxy are fast becoming the real infidels and infidel-makers of our country and time. Take the single fact, that in this year of grace 1860, when the slave trade is revived, and exercised with a fearful activity and prevalence, not known for forty years, and when the country is passing through a political campaign, of which, in the providence of God, the only really vital question, or living issue, is slavery; the ministerial associations and conferences of New England, with, we believe, not a single exception, meet, pray, confer, indulge in pious platitudes, but make no pronouncement whatever upon slavery, OR THE SLAVE TRADE, and do nothing at all, to bring the verdict of christianity and the church to bear against either of these foul abominations!

When even the New York Observer speaks, conferences and associations are dumb. The paper that for its pro-slavery proclivities and position for a long time back, obtained the high commendation from the South, that "there has not been seen, for many years, even the slightest condemnation of our institutions in its columns," now tardily says,

"We have evidence which is constantly accumulating that the slave trade is actively pushed by men in this country in spite of our laws, and the vigilance of those who are set to pre-

vent it. It is supported by a party at the South who believe it to be right and expedient: it is carried on by men at the North whose god is gold, and who would plunder heaven itself, as they defy hell, to make money. We must concentrate a public sentiment against the men, South and North, who are in favor of this accursed traffic, and especially we must be on our guard against the counsel of those who tell us there is no danger of the trade being re-opened."

"It is painful beyond measure to know that in this age of the world, and in these Christian cities, there are men claiming respectability, and supposed to be possessed of the common feelings of humanity, engaged in this traffic."

Let us have the respectable merchants of Boston or New York, who engage clandestinely in the trade, ferreted out, and brought to justice. It would be an example of terrible but wholesome force to hang a city Merchant for being accessory to the traffic in negroes between Africa and Cuba."

But all this while, Missionary Associations, and the great organizations of benevolence in New England, neither peep nor mutter against this abomination, nor do they attempt to destroy in this country, the great parent abomination, American slavery.

In Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Connecticut, the Congregational Ministry have met in their annual assemblies, and, with the aggressions of slavery, and the execrable slave trade in full view, and the Church Anti-Slavery Society knocking at their door, and asking friendly recognition and co-operation in its specific work of putting the practice of slaveholding under the opprobrium of church prohibition, as the scriptural and evangelical way of abolishing slavery; they give not the faintest token of sympathy with such a work; nor do they discuss the subject in any way; neither do they propose any method of their own, to make the christianity of the nation more effectively felt, against the national sin of oppression.

They utterly ignore the existence and activity of an organization within the churches, for putting slavery under the ban of excommunication, and for procuring from the churches an expression of christian abhorrence of slaveholding, and they pass no such independent expression themselves. In one case, when urged to affirm the principle of Albert Barnes, "that there is no power out of the church, that could sustain slavery an hour, if it were not sustained in it," and that the responsibility therefore, of a longer continuance of slavery in the United States, rests mainly, by reason of their controlling power over public opinion and practice, with christian churches and ministry, they give it the go-by, with the declaration, that "it has never been the fashion of that body, to represent the churches as having full power over the legislation and politics of the country, and that they cannot stultify themselves by admitting the church to be the great breast-work of slavery."

At the same time, with what the world construes as a puerile dog-in-the-manger temper, utterly unworthy the fraternity of editors, the organs of Congregationalism in Boston and New York, keep off, with their barking, many who would otherwise join in an honest attempt to rally the church against slavery. Eager to let the history of Herod and Pilates' concord, repeat itself in them, they unite with the pro-slavery New York Observer, in attack and misrepresentation of the Church of the Puritans and its pastor, and in "the refusal to support the Church Anti-Slavery Society," on the assumption "that it will do more harm than good, to the cause of liberty."

Like the Scribes and Pharisees of old, standing at the gate and commanding the ear of the churches, "ye neither enter in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering, to go in." Stoutly and sturdily has Elizur Wright written, of late, in regard to the "Editorial failures" of some, that ought to know better:

"One can have patience with a country parson, a closet-philosopher, or a literary milkmaid, failing to distinguish between a historical, pivotal, national fact, and a private, personal accident; but editors are supposed to comprehend passing history, and to know when a letter found in the

heel of a tramp's old boot, has political significance, and when it only signifies that the cobbler used too big a last. I confess my patience has lately been tried, even by my most favorite editors, and I must tell the world, somehow, that I cannot be held in any way responsible for their stupidity, to say nothing of their cowardice."

So much for the present position of New England Congregational churches and journals, in reference to any united and earnest movement for the abolition of slavery. Meantime the Old School General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, lately answers a memorial for more definite legislation in regard to the growing practice of slaveholding, that it sees no occasion for any further pronouncement on that subject. And the New School General Assembly, when urged by a memorial from the Mission church of Dakota, offered by Dr. Williamson, to instruct the committee on church extension, to aid no church which tolerates slaveholders in its membership, perpetrates the suicidal folly of refusing so to instruct their church extension committee, and adopts the stereotyped "complimentary flunkeyism," as follows:

That the permanent committee on Church Extension are fully aware of the ground which our church occupies with reference to this subject, and we have confidence that they will conscientiously discharge their duty with an enlightened regard to the promotion of righteousness and holiness in the church and in the world.

In the debate upon Dr. Williamson's Resolution before the General Assembly at Pittsburgh, he is reported to have said:

"Duty to God, and regard for the welfare of our church, our country, and ourselves, demand, that we adopt some measure tending to exclude this sin from our church; and that proposed in the resolution before us is the least that we can do and make our action consistent with the declarations of past Assemblies."

"I firmly believe what has been published on this subject by the Rev. Albert Barnes, one of the most celebrated ministers of our denomination, that the Christian churches of our country are accountable for the existence of slavery in it, and that without their support it must come to a speedy termination; and if this be true, an awful responsibility rests upon us."

"There are in our country between four and five millions of slaves. Supposing that our branch of the church be equal to only one-eighth of all the churches which receive slaveholders to the communion, and this will hardly be considered an over estimate of the moral power which we pos-

se."

"One would suppose that the New School brethren had forgotten the facts of history, as well as disregarded the injunctions of Scripture. At the time of the division in 1837, there were in the New School branch of the church only three slaveholding Presbyteries. John Rankin implored the Assembly at its first meeting after the schism to purge out this little lump of slaveholding leaven. But the same counsels prevailed then as now. It seemed to be thought that the best way to get crime out of the church was, to allow the criminal to remain in the church and come to the communion table and have his character endorsed by the Saints! And what was the effect of this unscriptural policy? Why the three slaveholding Presbyteries increased to twenty! The leaven spread and infected the whole body until another division became necessary. Now, under the lead of cowardly trimmers, the very same policy is inaugurated for fear of weakening the numbers of the church. Had the New School taken the advice of Mr. Rankin at the time of the first division, and become a real Anti-Slavery Presbyterian Church, it would have outnumbered the Old School far away. But now there is no motive in the world for the anti-slavery men and congregations in the Old School to connect with the New. They will not come to the Free Church because we are so few and so poor. Whereas if they could feel that their principles were safe in the New School, they would flock there in crowds. Thus we see how a sinful expediency defeats the very end it aims to accomplish. Unless the politicians give the death-blow to slavery, the New School will cherish the virus in her bosom until it poisons and deforms the whole body as it did before. This comes of a church setting up to be wiser than Jesus Christ, who commands that every persistent transgressor of the moral law shall be put out of the communion of the Saints until he repents and reforms.—Free Church Portfolio.

ness, we are accountable for holding in bondage 500,000 human beings. Now suppose we divide those among us and see for how many each of us is accountable. The present number of communicants may be about 150,000. If we assign two to each of these, there will be 200,000 still to be divided among the ministers and ruling elders. If we suppose the number of the latter to be five times as great as that of the ministers, and each of them to have only one-fifth as much moral influence as the average of the ministers, each ruling elder, on an average, will be responsible for holding in slavery from twelve to fifteen human beings, and each minister for the holding in bondage between sixty and sixty-five.

"Brethren, are you willing to bear this responsibility? I am not. I would flatter myself that much less of this responsibility rests on me than on many others for there is evidently a great difference among us in talents and moral power.—Still, even if only six instead of more than sixty, should be counted for my share, it is still far more than I am willing to bear. Perhaps there might be among them one of Christ's little ones, in reference to whom my judge will say in the last day: 'I was held in cruel bondage, not suffered to read my Father's Word, or to rest on his holy day, and you were the cause of it.'

I contend, in the second place, that we have Scriptural authority for such action as is here called for. We are told that there are slaveholders, who are truly pious, and that we have no right to exclude such from the communion of the church. Admitting the premises, I deny the conclusion. That there have been slaveholders who were truly pious, I fully believe. That there are some such still, I do not doubt. But that persons truly pious, may and ought, in certain circumstances, to be excluded from the communion of the church, is evident from the Scriptures, both of the old and new Testament.

Under the Old Testament we know that persons ceremonially unclean were so excluded, even in the cases where the uncleanness arose from causes which we can not suppose to have implied or been necessarily connected with moral pollution or turpitude; as the accidental touching of a dead body, or being present in a house where a person died. Did time permit, other passages of the Old Testament might be referred to. From the New Testament it is sufficient to refer to the case of the incestuous person at Corinth. We can hardly suppose that such a person would have been received to the communion of this, one of the most eminent of Apostolic churches or retained in it, if he had not given strong evidence of piety. Yet the Apostle Paul most positively enjoins to cast him out. *Speech of Dr. Williamson before the General Assembly at Pittsburgh, May 1860.*

Vain was this plea before the late New School General Assembly, just as similar pleas have been before with the American Board, to induce that Body to declare the practice of slaveholding such a sin that its renunciation should be made a condition of membership in its Mission Churches.

How baleful the influence of expediency upon the ministry and membership of the Christian Church! How sure one is, that opposes it, in behalf of the enslaved, to give offense to his brethren, and to be frowned upon as an agitator! How correct was the judgement of Dr. Channing:

"As to human favor, I feel more and more that it must be given up. If I know Christianity, it is so at war with the present condition of Society, that it cannot be spoken or acted on, without giving offense."

It is a great lesson to keep one's love serene and bright, under the opposition and sneers of brethren at honest labors in behalf of the oppressed. We have need to drink perpetually at the fountain so tenderly invoked in a sonnet found among the papers of the late Theodore Parker:

"Oh, Brother! who for us didst meekly wear
The Crown of Thorns about thy radiant brow;
What Gospel from the Father didst thou bear,
Our hearts to cheer, making us happy now?
'Tis this alone, the immortal Savior cries,
To fill thy heart with ever-acting love;
Love for the wicked, as in sin he lies,
Love for thy Brother here, thy God above:
Fear nothing ill, 'twill finish in its day,
Live for the Good, taking the ill thou must;
Toil with thy might, with manly labor pray,
Living and loving, learn thy God to trust,
And He will shed upon thy soul the blessings of the just."

HEAR ELIZUR WRIGHT.—In a letter to the *Tribune* he says.

"As to the slaveholders, talk ever so daintily, and swear ever so solemnly that we will not use our political power to set free the slaves in the States, they won't believe it, because they respect us too much. They know we ought to do it. So does every man who knows what Slavery is. An individual or a party making disclaimers in this direction is a fool wasting breath and getting laughed at for his pains, openly or in the sleeve. Slaveholders have no hope for their bestial institution except in our folly and wickedness. They carefully cultivate both, their most hopeful crop being the disclaimers in the Republican garden."

HOW THE ADOPTERS OF THE CONSTITUTION UNDERSTOOD IT.

Testimony of an Old Man.

EAST PEMBROKE N. Y., July 30, 1860.

DEAR BROTHER GOODELL.—Your correspondent I. S., has a quotation in the *Principia* of July 21, from the semi-weekly *Tribune* of June 5, that pleases me so well that I wish to state some things that I know in connection with it, and make some remarks. When Mr. Greeley was on his over-land tour to California, he made a speech in which he stated something like this. "Our Fathers had so great a repugnance to slavery that in the ordinance of 1787, they would not tolerate it, only as a punishment for crime." In sending my dollar for his weekly paper, I told him that our Fathers intended, and I was old enough to know the fact, to prohibit slavery entirely, and they only allowed that involuntary servitude might be inflicted for crime, the same as we allow to be right for state prison offences. In the same letter, I told him that I wanted that the Republican party should be very cautious about making concessions to the slave power, so that I could vote their ticket; that I believed there was no law for slavery, and commended to his notice "Mr. Spooner's Unconstitutionality of slavery," and I offered to give a handsome premium to any one who should refute it. Whether my writing had any influence on him in regard to Spooner's work, I do not know. Instead of refuting it he confirms it in very strong and terse language. He admits that the Constitution by its plain and comprehensive provisions, secures the liberty of all sane, innocent men; but implies that the intentions of the framers of the Constitution were of more consequence than the intentions of an equal number of the people who ratified it. I was a citizen of the United States at that time, and I have three brothers, still living, that are older than I am. So that my father, three brothers, and myself, made five, in one family, that ratified the Constitution, just as it reads. How many slaveholders were in the convention, I do not know, or where the history is, that tells how many there were, I do not know. If, however, they were all slaveholders, it would not alter their honest agreement to do right.

The articles of your correspondent I. S. on National sovereignty, I like much. However, there is one sentence in his number six, that I think he would do well to review. "You would look in vain to the Constitution to learn whether you have a right to the fruits of your own labor, or to what you honestly purchase, or to the enjoyment of your own wife and children." The right to liberty and property being a natural right, existed before the Constitution, but I think the Constitution secures the people in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property, or else it does not come up to the proper idea of a government. The Constitution guarantees the right or privilege of Habeas corpus, and when I read that, "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated," and that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," I feel satisfied that if the Constitution is administered in the same spirit in which it was established by the people, that my property, as well as my liberty, will be safe. About the "enjoyment of my own wife," none but slaveholding laws deny the right, and they violate the Constitution by impairing the obligation of contracts.

I have not only three brothers older, but also three brothers younger than myself, all (I suppose), still living. The youngest of the seven was born in 1794. None of them use spirituous liquors or tobacco. They were all school teachers in their day. They are all professors of religion. Two of them are ministers, and one of the two was for twenty years missionary to the Sandwich Islands. Those two obtained a College education. The fourth and seventh were physicians. You may do as you like about publishing any or all, or what part you please of this, and believe me as ever, your friend and brother, in the bonds of the gospel.

LUTHER BINGHAM.

OCTOORONS DECIDED NOT TO BE NEGROES IN VIRGINIA.

At a recent session of the Alexandria County Court, two men of mixed blood appeared before the Court, and, having proved themselves to be octoorons, or possessing one-eighth negro blood, asked the Court to certify that they were not negroes. The Court, having heard the evidence, granted the certificate asked for. The object of the process was to

release the parties applying, from the obligations and penalties attached to free negroes by the laws of Virginia.

From "The American Baptist."

THE WAR UPON DR. CHEEVER.

In all ages it has been the fate of those who contend for great principles to be misrepresented. Truth, liberty, and philanthropy have their roots so deeply interpenetrating human nature, that wherever an issue can be squarely presented, the popular verdict is sure to be in their favor. Hence the effort to show, in the case of reformers generally, that the contest in which they are engaged is not one of principles, but of personalities. Of such misrepresentations Dr. Cheever, of this city, has had his full share. Those misrepresentations will precede or accompany him on his present visit abroad, and will reduce, so far as their power extends, the interest and sympathy felt by freeborn Scots and Britons for this true and tried champion of human rights.

Shortly before the departure of Dr. Cheever, a very extraordinary article appeared in the *Independent*, calculated, as that paper has been the channel through which his communications have ordinarily been given to the public, to do him a much more serious injury than any of his open enemies could inflict. In answer to a letter from a Glasgow merchant, inquiring whether Dr. Cheever's church was really in such a state as to require the sending around of "a begging box in England and Scotland to sustain it," the *Independent* replies by advising "the friends to whom such an appeal is made, instead of entrusting funds to unknown parties on this side of the Atlantic, to send a deputation of shrewd and careful business men over to New York, to investigate that question for themselves." The *Independent* then goes on to make an expose of what he considers the facts in the case; designed to show that whatever may have been the origin of the controversies in the church, "its present distractions have no connection whatever with the subject of slavery;" that what is wanted in this quarrel "is not money, but common-sense and Christian grace;" that the main occasion of division is this question of "foreign begging," which was begun unnecessarily, at the very time when a generous subscription had been made by the society at large for canceling the debts; that in order to meet the liability of increased rents, as the church stands on leased ground, there would be needed a sinking fund of \$50,000, which John Bull would not be likely to risk, "as a donation to a divided congregation, which does not hold the fee of a single foot of soil;" that "there is no legal guarantee whatever, that money given for the support of an anti-slavery pulpit will be appropriated to any such use;" and finally that whatever is given should be "in the form of a direct testimonial to Dr. Cheever—secured and guarded for his own personal use and benefit." The *Independent* is quite eloquent in praise of Dr. Cheever for his anti-slavery efforts, and says he is quite as worthy of a testimonial as Mrs. Stowe; and that "such a man ought not to be left, even in appearance, in the humiliating attitude of soliciting aid for a church distracted by local controversies."

The *Independent*, while professing to favor Dr. Cheever, is evidently using the most efficient means to prevent his receiving material aid from abroad; for if his church, or the portion of it which sustains him, be unworthy of sympathy, we may take it for granted that British Christians will be slow to contribute any great amount as a mere personal favor. If a man whom the *Independent* acknowledges to be "a noble representative of the Christian Anti-slavery of America" cannot raise funds for a great object, in which his life is bound up, there would be small chance of success in attempting to raise funds for himself.

While testifying to the faithfulness of Dr. Cheever as an anti-slavery minister, the *Independent*, singularly enough, goes on to convict him of the grossest inconsistency by asserting, as "a well-attested fact, that, for nearly ten years, a slaveholder was a member in full communion in Dr. Cheever's church, and, instead of being disciplined, though the case was known to the officers of the church, was recently dismissed by letter as in good standing." Dr. Cheever, in answer to this charge, positively declares that neither he nor the officers of his church knew that the member in question, a lady from the South, was a slaveholder at the time of her reception, nor until near the time of her request for a dismission, nor did they then know she was a slaveholder, except by having a slave girl given her for her maid by her parents, and left on the homestead when she removed to the North." The *Independent*, however, produces a letter from the husband of the woman, in which he testifies that his wife "was a slaveholder during her entire connection with the church, which fact was well known to Dr. Cheever." If the editor of the *Independent* believes this to be true, why does he commend a minister who is guilty, not merely of inconsistency, but of a direct falsehood? If he does not believe it to be true, why publish it as evidence?

NOAH'S CURSE UPON CANAAN.

July 9th, 1860.

To Wm. Goodell. Dear Sir.—In the eleventh number of your articles on "American Oligarchy," you say that the curse pronounced by Noah upon Canaan was not of God. I have yet to learn that this is truth. How do you prove but that God, in this instance, used Noah, as an instrument to show to Canaan what would befall his posterity, at some future day?

Will you please to answer through the columns of "The Principia," and thereby oblige your friend, D. MELNOT.

Our words were—"The second argument, looking to race or color is founded on the curse pronounced by Noah, not by God: upon Canaan, not upon Ham, from whence it is strangely inferred that the posterity of Ham, who peopled Africa, (not the posterity of Canaan, who peopled Palestine), may justly be enslaved."

The words of Scripture are,

"And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him; and he said, Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant." Gen ix: 24, 26.

Wherein does our statement differ from the Scriptures? "It is written" that Noah (not that God) said these things. And we said that Noah, not God, said them? Can our friend point out the difference in the two statements? The common impression, (shared, it would seem by our friend) is, that God uttered this malediction. But the Bible does not say that he did. And we only noticed the fact that it does not. That is all we have to say of the matter.

Our friend demands, "How do you prove but that God in this instance, used Noah," &c.

We are not called upon to prove the negative. Those who assert the affirmative are bound to prove that, if they are able.

But how will they do it, without going out of the record, and becoming "wise above what is written?"

But we are not tenacious of this point. Should we concede a divine prediction in these words of Noah concerning Canaan, it would not affect the posterity of Ham, in Africa. Nor, if it did, would it justify their enslavement—any more than the prediction of the crucifixion of Jesus by the Jews, justified it. Had there been a prediction of negro slavery in America by professed Christians, the prediction would have been only a prediction of hypocrisy and wickedness.

RADICALISM OF INTERFERENCE.

The conservative "World" July 30, preaches radicalism and interference after this fashion.

"The indignant sympathy of all christendom was lately awakened by the outrage which removed a Jewish child from his parents. It is not likely that it will slumber now that a host of christian parents and children have been overwhelmed by a common destruction, and the like destruction impends over the large christian population of the Turkish provinces. Some thousands have perished already. But in Syria alone there are upward of 600,000 christians, who are now probably trembling in apprehension of a similar fate. It is no time to stand upon technicalities, nor to consult precedents. "Charity," said good Archbishop Tillotson, "is above rubrics;" and humanity is higher than national law. In fact, the necessity and duty of protecting the christian populations, under the fanatical despotism of the Ottoman Empire, has come to be an admitted principle of general law. The last treaty between the christian powers and the Porte recognized it. Russia has since assumed still more boldly the attitude of protector to the Greek christians, and Europe has admitted her right to do so. It is not likely that France will be more slack to protect the Catholics, nor that England will leave either to Russia or France, or both combined, the office of protector and avenger, under circumstances where it might so easily be made the means of furthering their ambitious encroachments, or endangering her own Asiatic possessions. Our own country has an interest in this matter—not the mere interest of humanity, though a free and powerful state might well allow such generous instincts to influence her policy."

And in this strain "The World" runs on, through a whole column, all unconscious of the fact that it is preaching up another "John Brown raid" for the protection of Christians in Virginia, who are denied the Bible, forbidden to marry, and subject to indignities, cruelties, outrages, lust, and slaughter, without the protection of law.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT AT THE SOUTH—THE DESTINY OF VIRGINIA.

If the disembodied spirit of John Brown be observant of earthly affairs, and ordinarily conversant with the primary rules of arithmetic, the aspect of affairs in Virginia at the present moment must greatly glorify his martyr's crown. For infinitely vaster evils than the largest preconceived results of the Harper's Ferry enterprise at any time involved, seem about to flow from that tragedy. Evils more seriously imperilling the stability of slavery, than all the rant and madness of practicable or impracticable abolitionism.

In saving the institution from such assaults as Brown's, large expenses were inevitable. In the first instance, it was thought that a quarter of a million would suffice to meet the extraordinary demand, and that sum was placed by the Legislature in the hands of a careful commission, instructed to disburse it with the utmost possible parsimony, any surplus to be returned to the treasury of the Commonwealth. But so far from there being any surplus, the claims have reached thrice the appropriated amount, and then with the fresh safeguards required by the invasion, new arsenals, armories and ammunition, and the whole of that military profusion into which the State is about to plunge, it seems reasonable to anticipate that the business is to cost the terrified community, little less than \$1,500,000.

To an active and industrious people, prosperous in all their doings, the addition of a million and a half of dollars to the annual assessment would be no serious matter. An equal amount is frequently saddled upon the people of this city, without provoking more than a cursory grumble. But Virginia, while rich in resources, is poor in results; and so heavy a weight heaped upon the already onerous load of taxation, causes grave complaint, and curious inquiry into the equivalent obtained at such monstrous expense. The equivalent is found to be nothing more than augmented security for slave property. No other property in the State is to be benefitted: it is simply called to pay for what is widely regarded as a questionable advantage; and one which certainly stands in the way of that free labor, which the western section of the Commonwealth needs and clamors for.

There is evident justice therefore, in the demand that the slaveholding interest shall bear at least, a fair proportion of an impost designed exclusively for its protection; and it has become a topic of bitter complaint, that so far from doing so, it has sheltered itself behind constitutional provision, agreeably to which, all slaves under twelve years of age are exempted from taxation. Estimating the entire slave population in 1860, at 500,000, and assuming the number of slave children to preserve the same ratio to the whole, as in 1850, we ascertain that two-fifths of the enslaved negroes of Virginia, are held, without affording any revenue to the treasury; in other words, that there is about \$70,000,000 of valuable property, the subject of purchase, sale, and active commercial treatment, and the protection of which, is the most serious business of the Government, which nevertheless pays nothing to the Government for protection. The existence of this anomaly is peculiarly felt in that portion of the commonwealth, technically known as Western Virginia, that part, namely, lying to the westward of the Alleghany range. There the favorite Southern institution is in the last stages of decay. The decrease of slave property proceeds at a more rapid rate than anywhere else beneath Mason and Dixon's line, and free labor is rapidly taking its place, bringing in capital, colonists, and new elements of material and political strength. While this movement is now, perhaps, more swiftly accelerated than at any previous period, it has, in fact, been in operation for thirty years past. The West has always disliked the despotic preponderance of the East; has recognized the partial legislation prevailing at Richmond; has submitted reluctantly to taxation, that the East might be indulged in all manner of internal improvements, while the West has been left to her natural resources, and has at every opportunity, struggled for more equitable representation, and more liberal treatment. Ten years ago all such efforts seemed hopeless. The dominant East had fixed the basis of representation in State Legislature, upon the total population of the State, counting the blacks, free and slave, at full value. The operation of this system, is discernable, from an inspection of the subjoined table, which presents the relative aggregates of population in the three sections, in 1850:

	Whites.	Free Colored.	Slaves.
Western Counties . . .	273,892	1,965	14,924
Valley Counties . . .	219,739	6,234	48,209
Eastern Counties . . .	401,259	46,144	409,596
Total . . .	894,890	54,343	472,729

The white population, therefore, of the trans-Alleghany Counties, had its political influence at Richmond more than neutralized by the slaves to the eastward of the mountains; or, what amounts to the same, a handful of large slaveholders in the valley, and along James river, ruled every department of the State Government absolutely. The determined discontent of the West, with this order of things, ne-

cessitated a revision of the constitution; and it was only after a sharp and threatening conflict, that the slave oligarchy was driven to concession. It yielded that the House of Delegates should hereafter be chosen upon an exclusively white basis, while the Senate should remain as before, until 1865, when the question of placing it upon the same footing as the House, should be opened for consideration, and, if necessary, submitted to a popular vote. It was, perhaps, as an indemnity for this act of magnanimity, that the slaveholders insisted on the immunity of slave children from taxation.

Nine years have elapsed since this new order of things was established. During this period, the cause of free labor has gained great strength. The agricultural and mining attractions of the Western counties have introduced a great immigration of free capital and labor, while the Valley of the James, and the counties adjacent to the Potomac are quickly filling with Northern farmers, who shun, as far as possible, the employment of slaves. During this period also, the exportation of negroes to the cotton States, has proceeded with augmented vigor; so that the non-slaveholding interest has been strengthening itself at all points; while the slaveholder is in a far less available position for defensive warfare, than when he yielded the constitution of 1851.

As we have remarked, the non-slaveholding party, of which the western section is the nucleus, are profoundly dissatisfied with the financial results of the Harper's Ferry business, and announce in no indefinite terms, their intention not to submit to the consequent imposts of the slaveholders, unless the exemption in favor of slave children be abandoned. The issues, we learn from various quarters, will be clearly raised at the approaching session of the Legislature. The House of Delegates, it is thought, will be disposed to meet the wishes of the West, while the Senate is looked to, by the East as its strong tower of resistance. Should the affair take this turn, there can be but one result. The non-slaveholders will add to the conditions upon which they will grant the desired subsidy, a demand that the basis of Senatorial representation be at once placed on the same plane with that of the Delegates; and thus the prescriptive despotism of the slave owning interest will be brought to an end. The star of empire will take its natural course westward, and free labor finally predominate in the councils of the Old Dominion.

In undertaking his irrational and purely visionary attempt, John Brown, it is fair to presume, never dreamed of these indirect consequences. His devices were mere midsummer madness: the remedy he offered to the social disorders of the old commonwealth, was fraught with certain and violent destruction. Yet, if from this quarrel over the cost of safety, comes the state of affairs we have for so many reasons, and upon so conclusive data predicted, the blood of the sturdy old martyr, will not have been shed in vain. It will spring up in a harvest of domestic dissensions, in which slavery is pretty sure to be worsted, and driven from the field.—N. Y. Times, Aug. 20.

If the intimate friends and associates of John Brown had testified before the Investigating Committee of the Senate, on this particular point, we think it more than probable that they would have said that "the sturdy old martyr"—"irrational and purely visionary," as the Times still considers him, understood and calculated upon the results now recorded by the Times, along with much more "it is fair to be presumed," than the Times has yet "dreamed of"—but which it will have the sagacity to discover in due time. Certain it is, that the then anticipated results, now become history, were topics of familiar conversation among abolitionists, and of discussion in their journals, during the Harper's Ferry excitement. It takes a thoroughly radical abolitionist to see an inch before his nose, on the slavery question.

Nevertheless, we congratulate the Times. It is making creditable progress. Some time since, it discovered that slaves are claimed as property, and that if the claim be allowed, it will subvert the liberties of the Free States. Now, it has discovered the "irrepressible conflict" between slavery and freedom in Virginia. By and by, it will discover the impotency of its own silly assaults on Dr. Cheever. Our readers shall be kept duly posted on the changes of the fluctuating Times.

WM. WALKER, the filibuster, has landed in Honduras, with a small force, and taken possession of the small town of Truxillo. It is not supposed that he can long retain possession of it.

REPUBLICAN NOMINATION.—The Republican State Convention at Syracuse, has re-nominated Gov. Morgan, and Lieut. Gov. Campbell.

Considerable injury has been done in the southern parts of Ohio, by drought.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 25, 1860.

STATE RIGHTS—THE BOOTH CASE—NATIONAL ABOLITION.

So long as the people of the non-slaveholding States continue to recognize as a "State Right" the right of the slaveholders to maintain slavery, and to remain slaveholders, so long it will be utterly in vain for them to think of having any State action, legislative or Judicial, that shall vindicate THEIR OWN "State Right" of maintaining freedom. Rights never conflict with each other; and where opposing claims are urged as "rights" one or the other of them must give way, of course.

This is the reason why the Legislatures of Massachusetts, New York, and other States, do not pass Personal Liberty Bills, for the protection of the personal liberty of all men within their borders. It is seen distinctly that such enactments would involve a denial of the "State Right" of the "Slave States," to maintain slavery. This is always urged by the opponents of the measure, in our State Legislatures and, with the single exception of Vermont, the argument has prevailed.

So also in Wisconsin, where the Judiciary, in the first place, in the case of Booth, declared the Fugitive Slave Bill unconstitutional, and where the Legislature, afterward, sustained the Judiciary. But when the Federal Government, by recognizing the "State Right" of maintaining slavery, trampled down, by the seizure and imprisonment of Booth, the "State Right" of Freedom to Wisconsin, what was witnessed? Why, just this. The State Judiciary, over-awed by the "State Right" of slavery, thus enforced, refused the Habeas Corpus, that is, gave up the "State Right" of Wisconsin to freedom! Booth was, however, liberated by the citizens. And in doing it, they trampled upon the pretended "State Right" of maintaining slavery.

Does Vermont furnish an exception? By no means. Her Personal Liberty Bill, on the very face of it, is a flat denial of the "State Right" of maintaining slavery. So it was understood and represented, at the time, by its opponents. And so they have regarded it, ever since. So long as Vermont maintains her Personal Liberty Bill, in full force, so long will she maintain, in that particular, her denial of the "State Right" of slaveholding. If the trial should ever come in Vermont, as in Wisconsin, and if the Vermont authorities, like those of Wisconsin, should falter, it will be from the same cause. It would involve the same result. Vermont would then recognize the "State Right" of slaveholding, and of maintaining slavery.

In every conceivable case, the same fact will be witnessed. Every State that maintains its "State Right" to Liberty, will, of necessity, in so doing, deny the assumption of a "State Right" to maintain slavery. And, vice versa; every State that recognizes the assumed "State Right" of maintaining slavery, will deny and relinquish the "State Right" of maintaining freedom. In the nature of things, it cannot be otherwise.

It will avail nothing to say that each State has a "State Right" to maintain either slavery or freedom, as it pleases. This is not true. If one State has a right to allow slavery, no other State has a right to forbid it. If it be the duty of one State to maintain freedom, it is the duty of every other State to maintain freedom. We speak of moral right, political right, and Constitutional right, when we say this. The moral, political, and Constitutional rights of the States are equal, because they are identical. No State has a right to invade human rights, but every State is bound to protect them.

Nor will it avail to say that the Federal Government has no right to interfere in the matter, either the one way or the other. It is bound to interfere, and could not help interfering, if it would. If the slave States have a "State Right" to maintain slavery, then the Federal Government, as the guardian of "State Rights" is bound to assist in maintaining them, if violated by other States. This is the ground upon which the present administration acts, and upon which all previous administrations have acted. It is the ground upon which all future Federal Administrations will act, so long

as they recognize the "State Right" of maintaining slavery. And, accordingly, the Republican candidate, Abraham Lincoln, says, that the Slave States are entitled to a Fugitive Slave Bill. Mr. Lincoln is doubtless correct, if the Slave States have a "State Right" to maintain slavery. But if they have not, he is wrong.

These obvious truths should serve to show the opponents of Fugitive Slave bills of 1793, and of 1850, the work they have before them. They have got to deny, and to bring the people of the non-slaveholding States to deny, the "State Right" of maintaining slavery, before they will ever bring themselves and the community up to the ground of maintaining, steadily, perseveringly, and effectually, the "State Right" of maintaining freedom. An excited multitude may rescue a fugitive slave. Men pledged by their political creeds not to interfere with slavery in the States, may assist to liberate Mr. Sherman M. Booth. But the so-called free States will be infested with the blood-hounds of slavery, and personal liberty will remain insecure, until the notion of a "State Right" to allow slaveholding shall have been exploded by the masses of the people. The day, we trust, is approaching. The new "League of Freedom" in Wisconsin looks like day-break. And when that day approaches its meridian, there will be a resistless demand for a National Administration that, repudiating "State rights" to maintain slavery, shall protect the right of every State, and all its inhabitants, to freedom.

THE DECADE FROM 1850 TO 1860.

If the Douglas party succeeds, it gives us but the Democratic party as it was in 1850, only saddled with the additional infamy and guilt of the "Dred Scott decision," and of the pro-slavery repeal of the Missouri Compromise, for the sake of extending slavery north of 36° 30'.

If the Republican party succeeds, it gives us but the Whig party of 1850, only without the flag of "Wilmot proviso" then claimed by the Northern wing of the party.

The Whigs and Democrats of 1850, gave us the Fugitive Slave bill. The Douglas party and the Lincoln party of 1860, agree in letting it remain on the statute book, and enforcing it, when necessary.

The Democrats as well as the Whigs of 1845-50, were strongly tinged with the doctrines of the "Wilmot proviso," or "No more slave States." Mr. Wilmot himself being then a Democratic leader. In 1860 no Democratic or Republican leader, not even Mr. Wilmot himself, nor Seward, Chase, Lincoln, Greeley, nor even Giddings or Sumner, has a word to say about "No more slave States."

The Whig party of 1840 to 1850—at least the Northern wing of it, claimed to be the "true abolition party,"—on the same platform, essentially with the Liberty party, inasmuch that the nomination of Birney was declared to be superfluous and factious, dividing the forces of Abolitionism.

The Republican leaders of 1860, repel the imputation of abolitionism as a slander, out-vie the Democrats in their sneers at the negroes, proclaim themselves the "white man's party," the only party, that, if successful, could quell anti-slavery agitation, and "COERCE" anti-slavery men into acquiescence.

The Whig party while it lived, courted abolition votes. The Republicans have now ceased asking for them. The Whig and Free Soil leaders, told us that "half a loaf was better than none." Republicanism now offers us no "half loaf," but only a stone in the place of it.

Such is now the ascertained result of the "half-loaf" policy, and those who commended it are now chuckling over it, and threatening their dupes with the chastisement due to their gullibility.

DR. CHEEVER'S RECEPTION IN ENGLAND

Nothing could be more gratifying to the friends of Dr. Cheever and to the church of the Puritans, than his enthusiastic reception in England. Some account, from an English paper, of his appearance and speech at the Anniversary of British West India Emancipation celebrated, the first of August, in London, will be found in our columns.—A correspondent of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, of this city, relates further particulars.

The London Anti-Slavery Committee, it seems, had adopted a written address, prepared by George Thompson, late Member of Parliament, as Chairman. At a soiree given by Dennis McDonell, Esq. at his residence, this address was

read by Mr. Thompson, followed by some extemporaneous remarks, to which Dr. Cheever responded. Among the gentlemen present, were "Rev. J. Stoughton, Editor of the *Evangelical Magazine*, and Minister of the Congregational Chapel, Kensington; Rev. W. O'Neill, M. A. minister of Broad-Street Chapel, London, (formerly the Chapel of Dr. Watts), Mr. A. R. Ibishen, M. A. of the College of Preceptors, and Professor in the London University, Mr. Clarke, of the *Christian World*, &c.

The following passage in the address of the London Anti-Slavery Committee, may serve to correct the impression of some in this country, even including abolitionists, that Dr. Cheever's espousal of the Anti-Slavery Cause is of a recent date.

"Your attachment to the cause of the slave is of no recent growth or development. The Chairman of this Committee has borne public and grateful testimony to your heroic conduct in the year 1835 (a year which will be ever memorable in the annals of the American Abolition Movement)—a year of fiery persecution, gag-law and mob violence, when you spontaneously opened the place of worship in which you then ministered, to the British advocate of immediate emancipation, and stood by him unflinchingly, till the fury of the storm led him to seek the preservation of his life, by departing from your city. This fact in your anti-slavery history would, we venture to think, alone be sufficient to secure for you the confidence of British Abolitionists. But your claim upon their confidence and gratitude rests also upon more recent acts, which have demonstrated how deep and unchangeable were the principles you espoused a quarter of a century ago.

In his extemporaneous Address, and speaking in his own behalf. Mr. Thompson said:—

"For myself, allow me to say that the sentiments contained in this address are no mere ebullition of recently awakened admiration of your character. My knowledge of the steadfastness with which you adhere to the principles which you early derived from the Word of God, is founded upon the uniform career you have pursued for five and twenty years. In 1835, when you were a minister of the gospel in Salem, Massachusetts, and I was a missionary in the cause of negro emancipation in the United States, in that year of darkness and of danger, when he who avowed himself the friend of 'the abolition incendiary, George Thompson,' was exposed to the fury of pro-slavery mobs—in that year of riotings, and burnings, and lynch law, you, already an intrepid champion of free speech, received me to your home, your pulpit and your heart, and 'made yourself of no reputation,' nay, risked life itself, rather than yield to the behest of an infuriated multitude (loud cheers). The foreigner whom you befriended then, welcomes you with joy and gratitude to the metropolis of his native land—the more so, that you have given me the crowning proof of your anti-slavery sincerity and nobleness of character, by appearing on the same platform in the city of New York, and again in Boston, with my cherished friends, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and their devoted coadjutors."

The *British Standard*, of August 3d, says:

"Dr. Cheever has made a noble commencement of his Christ-like mission. The assembly at Spaffelds Chapel, which was both large and respectable, manifested an intelligence equal to the full comprehension of the great subject in all its length, breadth and bearings. The meeting was one of a deeply interesting character. Dr. Cheever was, of course, the great centre of attraction, and, as such, it became him to occupy most of the evening, which he did in a manner highly satisfactory to all present. The address, which we publish verbatim, was less an oration than a dissertation, which, for point, force and brilliancy, we believe has never been surpassed on the anti-slavery platform."

THE WAR AGAINST DR. CHEEVER.—We were not mistaken in saying that there was a fixed determination to drive Dr. Cheever away from the Church of the Puritans, or to crush the Church, if it persisted in adhering to him. We had seen too many similar operations to be in any doubt of the indications. It is not abolitionists alone that have understood the matter as we do. The *Christian Intelligencer*, a Dutch Reformed paper, of the most conservative type, spoke of the attack of the *Independent* as being "an assault of bitterness and of subtle malice"—the result of "personal envy."

Within the week past the *World* and the *Times* have returned ferociously to the onset. The *Independent* professes great friendship for Dr. Cheever, but when his Church replies to its attack, declines publishing it. The fact of its refusal, appeared in the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, of Aug. 4, in the most authentic form—a note from Dr. Leavitt, to which the editor appended some remarks. We expected to see some allusion to it, in the *Independent* itself, with, per-

haps, some explanation or defence. But we have found nothing. So we publish the note, from the Standard, and let it speak for itself.

"The Independent commented upon published documents touching Dr. Cheever's Chuseb. It avoided personalities, and complimented Dr. Cheever. Nobody has the shadow of a right to be heard in our columns in reply to our opinions upon facts which everybody can study for himself. If our article contains any errors of fact, and Dr. Harit will say what they are, in civil language, and without commentary or argument, and will furnish reliable evidence that the alleged errors of fact are indeed such, we shall be happy to make the correction. J. LEAVITT.

"August 4th, 1860.

For the Editors of The Independent.

So the Independent cannot afford to let its readers hear both sides of the argument; nor even inform them that the Church of the Puritans has replied to its accusations, at all. Well. The Independent probably knows what course its exigencies require.

A SIGN OF THE TIMES.—The Tribune of Aug. 7, under the head of "NEGRO VOTING" comes out against property qualification for colored voters, in this State. It says:

"If a negro owns \$250 worth of real estate, free and clear of incumbrance, he can vote the same as a white man; if not, he has no right of suffrage 'that white men are bound to respect.' We regard this discrimination as simply atrocious. If a Property Qualification is right, it ought to be imposed on all alike, not merely on those who have the least property, and the worst chance to obtain it; if a negro has no soul, and no political status but that of a thing, his owning a pile of dirt cannot rightfully give him any. In any light, the present rule is wrong and indefensible.

We shall have a chance this Fall to vote down this anomaly, and we ought to do it. Let us abolish the Property Qualification, and give the poor blacks an equal chance at the polls with their richer brethren. They are but a handful anyhow, and cannot do much harm if they try. We shall have a Constitutional Convention in 1866 if not sooner, and then decide whether black men shall vote at all or not, according to the light meantime vouchsafed us. Let us kick the Property Qualification overboard anyhow; and now is the time.

What does this mean? Is "the white man's party" in danger of needing "negro votes" next November? Is it frightened by the "notice of a nominating convention of radical abolitionists at Syracuse?" Is it preparing to court abolition votes by claiming to have an abolition party and abolition candidates? Is the Republican party to be denominated "the true abolition party" as was the Whig party in 1844? It would be, if that were accounted necessary to success. Some of us remember how the Tribune lent a cold shoulder to the "Negro suffrage question" two or three years ago, and advised the negroes to keep at work earning money, and let politics and the suffrage alone? Even now, the Tribune keeps one anchor to windward, by hinting that if negro suffrage don't pay, there will be a chance to back out of it, and throw it off again, in 1866.

"THE WORLD," July 30, discourses on the African slave trade, and on our national responsibilities in respect to it, as follows:

"The truth is, that this infamous traffic has not been pursued with such impunity as at present. Pronounced piracy by all the nations of the civilized world, and costing most of them large sums of money yearly, and many lives, in the maintenance of fleets in unhealthy latitudes, it is yet pursued with such profit that another fleet, that of the traders, is yearly consumed—literally burned, a holocaust in its honor. This is the great sin; but the great shame to us is, that the principal part of this trade is carried on under the American flag, and that this city is the greatest slave-trading mart in the world. True, the trade is almost entirely in the hands of foreign houses: but still, they do their business here, and bring upon us part of the responsibility, and all of the evil repute which rightly attaches to it. A list of slavers, known to have been sailing under the American flag during the last year and a half, has been published—eighty five in number—and this, we may be sure, is not complete. The subject is one which presses upon our attention, and demands prompt, vigorous, and intelligent action. The wide-spread interest which it is exciting will be kept alive by the very full exposition of it which we give elsewhere, from an entirely competent, and, we may say, authoritative source.

What if some of "The World's" good christian brethren at the South, should berate it for this "interference" with their right to import slaves, in the use of the same logic and language that The World employs against Dr. Cheever, and the abolitionists, for interfering with their right to hold the same slaves after they are imported, and also their right of

enslaving the children, and children's children to all generations, of the slaves thus imported, whether by themselves, or by their great-great-grand-fathers? How would "The World" answer them back again, but by stealing the thunder of the abolitionists, as in fact it now does?

Is "The World" so ignorant as not to know that the slave trade stands condemned "by the civilized world" because it introduces, promotes, and perpetuates slaveholding?

And does it not know that the British Parliament, after elaborate investigation, has demonstrated and proclaimed to the world, long ago, that the only practicable way of putting a stop to the slave traffic, is to put a stop to slaveholding? It is too late in the day for a journal to expect credit for honesty and common sense, in opposing the slave trade, unless it opposes slaveholding, or in branding the former as "infamous," without equally branding the latter.

"THE INEXORABLE LOGIC OF THE CONTEST."—This is the heading of an editorial article in the Herald, on the political issues of the Presidential campaign. Superficial as may be the views of the Herald, there is, indeed an inexorable logic in the contest concerning slavery. Neither of the great contending parties, has indeed grappled with that issue, except the Breckenridge Democracy. All the others are attempting, in their various ways, to dodge the issue, and avoid "the inexorable contest."

But it must come. As certainly as the laws of nature continue to operate, as certainly as the purposes of the Creator are destined to fulfillment, just so certainly the conflict must come. In some sort, it is indeed present already. The "inexorable logic" of events, under the overruling providence of God, is continually pressing it on. Slavery is to overspread and subjugate the whole country, or give place to universal freedom. Liberty is to exterminate slavery, or be exterminated by it. Here lies "the inexorable logic of the contest." The Herald, The Tribunes, and all the other overshadowing journals of the country, may ignore it. Their political parties may ignore it. But it will likewise ignore them, and ride over them, and bury them in the sands of oblivion, if they fail to recognize its presence, and to adjust themselves to its forces.

A CASE FOR SYMPATHY AND ASSISTANCE.

MR. SMILE CALHOUN, of Sussex Co., Delaware, a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, (as is attested by official members), was arrested on charge of assisting the flight of fugitive slaves. The "owner" of the slaves recaptured them, yet compelled Mr. Calhoun to convey to him his homestead, including house and land, to purchase his release, and enable to escape from the State. He fled, leaving his wife and children behind. And they will, in a few months, be compelled to leave their home, and will be turned out of doors. We have seen the testimonials to the facts, which he has procured, by mail, from several of his old neighbors, including members and officers of the M. E. Church, and two gentlemen who sign as Notaries Public. There can be no doubt of the correctness of the statements.

Mr. Calhoun had, by the industry and economy of himself and family, acquired a comfortable home, and is now left homeless. He needs the aid of the benevolent to furnish the means of removing his family, to a free State, procuring household furniture, farming utensils, a cow, and a team, so that he may cultivate a small hired farm. We have become personally acquainted with Mr. Calhoun, while he has been, for some time in this city, waiting to receive the necessary testimonials, and have become greatly interested in him. He seems to be an honest, sensible, pious man, guilty only of having obeyed the Savior's Golden Rule.

Money for Mr. Calhoun will be received at the office of The Principia, 339 Pearl Street, New York, by MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS or WILLIAM GOODSELL.

OUR EXCHANGES.—Some of our exchange papers still continue to direct to "Radical Abolitionist" instead of "The Principia," in consequence of which we miss many numbers of them, thrown aside, at our Post Office. Will publishers please revise their Direction Books?

The Cincinnati Gazette is recording testimony to prove that "Mr. Lincoln's Congressional course" is endorsed by "Union men" Very natural.

NOTICE.

WEDNESDAY 20th of AUGUST, is the time finally agreed upon for holding the RADICAL ABOLITION CONVENTION at Syracuse.

The Convention will meet at 10 o'clock, A. M., to nominate candidates for President and Vice President of the United States; also to nominate candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of this State.

The men and women of this, and other States, who occupy radical positions in Anti-Slavery and Temperance, are earnestly invited to attend, and take part in this convention.

W. W. CHAPMAN,
J. C. HARRINGTON,
OTIS SIMMONS.

} Central
Committee.

MINETTO, N. Y. July 5th, 1860.

We cordially concur in the above call for a Convention; and we hope it will be attended by hundreds of earnest men and women.

We believe in a religion of justice and mercy, and we cannot consent to apostatize from it, at the ballot-box, more than elsewhere.

We believe that man was made to love God and his fellow man, and we cannot consent to trample upon beautiful and glorious human nature at the ballot-box, more than elsewhere.

These being our beliefs, we sternly refuse to vote for candidates who are opposed to suppressing the dramshop, that most prolific source of degradation and danger to man and of blasphemous insults to God.

So do we refuse to vote for candidates who would send back to slavery the brother or sister who had escaped from that hell of horrors. So do we refuse to vote for candidates who would make the social, civil, or political right of one variety of human family even a hair's-breadth less than those enjoyed by another.

So in short do we refuse to vote for any candidate who would recognize a law for slavery, any more than a law for murder.

Signed.

ONTARIO Co., N. Y.—J. W. Duffin, George Lincoln, Samuel Crandall, George T. Fisher

ONONDAGA Co., N. Y.—John P. Belker, T. G. White, M. Merrick, Charles Merrick, William Cooper, C. D. B. Mills, WYOMING Co.—B. W. Lyman, L. P. Frost, H. M. Waldo. F. B. Bushnell, O. Hitchcock.

FULTON Co.—A. S. Leaton, Rensselaer Livingston, Wm. M. Harris.

MADISON Co.—Samuel Breese, Otis Simmons, Gerrit S. Simmons, Horace Simmons, Lafayette Simmons, Ezra Campbell, Ezra Campbell, Jr., Otis Campbell, Gerrit Smith, Horace Stowell, A. Lewis, Geo. W. Patham, Noah Tyler, Charles Lewis, Albert Lewis, Caleb Calkins, George Lewis, Silas T. Fyler, James Ferguson, Silas Keller, Silas B. Fyler, Joseph Fancher, Wm. A. Babcock, John A. Foster, Pixley Curtis, Benj. F. Remington.

OSWEGO Co.—John B. Edwards, Hamilton Littlefield, Hiram Gilbert, Andrus Gilbert, Jacob Kendall.

LEWIS Co.—Olney Place, S. H. Taft.

JEFFERSON Co.—Joseph Osborn.

CAYUGA Co.—Henry Collins, Archibald Green, John Mitchell, John W. Sawyer, Abner A. Armstrong.

CORTLAND Co.—Victor Kingsley, Luther Wellington, M. I. Palmer, Cyrus P. Grosvenor, Silas Hammond.

CATTARAUGUS Co.—Wm. Shattuck, Sylvester Caswell, Otis Hitchcock, Truman Hitchcock, David Strong, Darius Bowing, Timothy Everit, Alvan Plumley, Solomon Nichols, Frederick Dexter, Franklin Nichols, Numan Nichols, Phineas Noble, Nelson Boardman, Joseph Plumb.

HERKIMER Co.—Edwin Pratt, Truman Cole, L. D. Metcalf, Zenas Brackett, Josiah Rice.

BROOME Co.—Charles A. Hammond.

ONEIDA Co.—Ira Hills, G. L. Brackett, Wm. Lawson, Charles Lawson, I. K. Casterton, Manley M. Hills, Geo. W. Bronson, Ira Hills, Sereno Moses, Seeley Hills.

KNOX Co., OHIO.—Rev. T. B. Dawson, Robert Dawson, R. Welsh, E. W. Welsh, John Boyd, Henry Chandler, S. B. Dodd, M. D., W. P. Pierson, Rev. Joseph Whitham, S. B. Cline, Joseph A. McFarland.

OHIO.—W. A. Hunter, Rev. John Pettit, A. Ames, Rev. C. A. Hoyt, Wm. N. Hudson, John Frost, N. H. Townsland, Rev. S. T. Boyd, A. Beecher, Rev. T. B. McCormick.

GUERNSEY Co., OHIO.—I. H. Dille, Martin Hays, I. H. Waller, Eleazar Thompson, Thos. B. Crusson, Andrew Haslet, J. H. Webster, John Rainie, John Morrison, J. C. Hickman, I. W. Umstat, T. C. Morrison, Gamaliel Thompson, Jas. H. Thompson, L. S. Thompson, Robert Thompson.

R. Lowrey.

INDIANA.—Rev. L. Wilson, Rev. George Ritchey.

MICHIGAN.—John Lowery.

PENNSYLVANIA.—W. H. Greer, Robert Job, Samuel No-

land.

WASHINGTON Co., PENN.—George Buchanan, E. T. Ag-

new, Samuel McFarland, James P. Welsh.

ILLINOIS.—J. W. Mahan, Rev. Geo. W. Bassett.

VIRGINIA.—George Whitham, Peregrine Whitham.

A CALIFORNIA TRIAL.—A fellow named Donks was lately tried at Yuba city, for entering a miner's tent and seizing a bag of gold dust, valued at eighty-four dollars. The testimony showed that he had once been employed there, and knew exactly where the owner kept his dust; that on the night of October 19th, he cut a slit in the tent, reached in, took the bag, and then ran off.

Jim Butler, the principal witness, testified that he saw the hole cut, saw the man reach in, and heard him run away.

"I put for him at once," continued the witness, "but when I caught him, I didn't find Bill's bag; but it was found afterwards, where he had thrown it."

Counsel for the Prisoner.—How far did he get in, when he took the dust?

Buller.—He was stoopin' well over—about half in, I should say.

Counsel.—May it please your honor, the indictment isn't sustained, and I shall demand an acquittal on the direction of the court. The prisoner is on trial for entering a dwelling in the night time, with intent to steal. The testimony is clear, that he made an opening, through which he protruded himself about half way, and stretching out his arms committed the theft. But the indictment charges that he actually entered the tent or dwelling. Now, your honor, can a man enter the house, when only one half of his body is in, and the other half out?

Judge.—I shall leave the whole matter to the Jury. They must judge of the law and the facts, as proved.

The jury brought in a verdict of 'guilty' as to one half of the body from the waist up, and 'not guilty' as to the other half.

The judge sentenced the guilty half, to two year's imprisonment, leaving it to the prisoner's option to have the 'not guilty' half cut off, or to take it along with him. A judgment, we think, worthy of Solomon.—*Cincinnati World.*

The "counsel for the prisoner" we think, must have studied law in the office of some pro-slavery lawyer, where he had learned to place technicalities before justice, and to shield theft under cover of misnamed law.

The halving business, too, is a fair corollary from pro-slavery jurisprudence, which makes a slave a person when he commits crime, and accordingly punishes him, but, in every other case, calls him a chattel. The half of him that steals from a white man is a person, with responsibilities—the other half, "has no rights that a white man is bound to respect."

Compromises with slavery and slaveholders, work in the same way. One half of Henry Clay's Missouri compromise, giving to the slaveholders Missouri, was binding; the other half, giving Kansas to freedom, was not; so, also, the half of the Virginia 1798 "State rights" doctrine, gives a slave State, a right to maintain slavery, while the other half gives a non-slaveholding State, no right to maintain freedom.

And the nation, by permitting one half of itself to be condemned to the prison house of slavery, finds itself in the same predicament with the thief sentenced by the discriminating Judge, in the story. The whole nation forfeits its freedom for having consented to the crime of the other half.

All pro-slavery and dough-face constructions and interpretations of the constitution, are off-shoots of the same half-and-half logic. The constitution means as it says, when that meaning suits the slaveholders, but otherwise, when it does not suit them; and the legal rules of interpretation, are followed or broken, just as the exigencies of slaveholders require them to be. "Strict construction" and "the supposed intentions of the framers" alternating skillfully, divide the Constitution into two parts, one half playing the thief, and the other half playing legs and feet, innocently, to support him.

The expedient of solving the slavery problem, by dividing the Union, goes on the assumption that legs and feet, being innocent of the theft, may run away, and leave the prey in the hands of the thief. All "half-loaf" compromises belong to the same category.

"DOUGLAS DUMB."

"A QUESTION TO DOUGLAS UNANSWERED."

Under this head, the *N. Y. Tribune* of 21st inst., relates how Judge Douglas declined answering the following question, propounded to him by "an estimable citizen of Augusta, Maine."

QUESTION:

"Do you hold, and if elected President of the United States, would you carry out, the doctrine that the people of a Territory, before it becomes a State, have the power, under the Federal Constitution, and notwithstanding the Dred Scott decision, to prohibit or exclude Slavery therefrom?"

"In other words:

"Do you affirm that the people of a Territory have the Constitutional right to crush the cockatrice's eggs, as soon as these are deposited in its nest by the propagandists of Slavery, or must they tolerate the incubation, and wait till the eggs become full grown and active vipers, that can be pursued and exterminated only by the newly-created sword of State authority?"

The *Tribune* does not tell its readers how "Honest Abe Lincoln" declined answering a number of questions "propounded to him by an estimable citizen" of Rural, Illinois, as published in the *Principia* of 18th inst.

So, it seems, we have a couple of "dumb" candidates, each of whom have, successively, enjoyed the favor of the *Tribune*, when candidates for office.

News of the Day.

DR. CHEEVER IN LONDON.

ANNIVERSARY OF NEGRO EMANCIPATION.

From the *London Star*, Aug. 2

A public meeting to celebrate the abolition of British Colonial Slavery was held last night in Spafelds Chapel, Exmouth-street, Clerkenwell. The large chapel was well filled by a most respectable audience.

In the absence of Sir Morton Peto, M. P., who by letter expressed his deep regret at not being able to attend, Rev. T. E. Thoresby, the minister of the chapel, was called upon to preside. On and around the platform we observed Revs. Dr. Campbell and Dr. Burns, Revs. Thomas James, Dawson Burns, John Stroughton, George Smith, H. Richard, W. O'Neil, R. Ashton Dace, W. Owen, G. Rose, Bonner, J. C. Galleway, and W. Mitchel, Messrs. George Thompson, Wilcocks, D. McDonnell, W. Heaton, E. Fry, W. Wilks, W. Farmer, Croft, W. H. Day, &c., &c.

The Chairman, after stating the order of business, said he had peculiar pleasure in introducing to the meeting Rev. Dr. George B. Cheever, of New-York, to whom an address of welcome to England had been presented in the former part of the day by the London Emancipation Committee. He was sure that the assembly would heartily rejoice in having Dr. Cheever among them. [Cheers.]

Rev. G. Smith (one of the Secretaries of the Congregational Union of England and Wales) moved the first resolution, welcoming Dr. Cheever to this country, and assuring him of its entire and hearty concurrence in the uncompromising principles upon which he has conducted his protracted controversy with the defenders and apologists of Slavery in Church and State; expressing its admiration of the fidelity, learning and eloquence he has displayed in his vindication of the Holy Scriptures from the impious charge of containing a divine warrant for the holding of "property in man;" and wishing him God speed in the efforts he may make to arouse the attention of the churches of Great Britain to the enervating, corrupting, and desolating influences of Slavery upon the religious bodies of the United States. It was that day seven-and-twenty years that the British people accomplished the great work of emancipating 800,000 human beings whose only crime was that of having a black skin. [Cheers.] That glorious act he attributed, under God, to the Christian Church, which had united itself and declared that British Slavery should be brought to an end. And he could not but believe that if the American Churches followed this example, human bondage in that country would also soon cease to exist. He held it to be the duty of the Christian people of England to encourage their brethren on the other side of the Atlantic, who were true-hearted in this matter, and rejoice in the presence of so warm-hearted an advocate of the equality of the human family as Dr. Cheever, who had done great good in America, and not a little by his writings in this country also. Dr. Cheever, as an honored man, a faithful servant of God, would meet with a hearty reception by the Christian and liberty-loving people of England. [Cheers.] The reverend gentleman spoke in strong terms of the sin and evil of negro slavery, and declared it to be an abomination which ought to be put down with the least possible delay.

Rev. J. Stroughton, in seconding the resolution, spoke in very high terms of Dr. Cheever, and he said he entertained sentiments of profound respect for the American people, but it was to him an inexplicable puzzle how they could be attached to the principles of freedom, and yet deny the right of the colored race to possess the liberty they themselves enjoyed. [Hear, hear.] He could easily understand that there were practical difficulties in the way of emancipation, but could not imagine how it was that the Christian men of America were not prepared calmly and kindly to look at those difficulties, and endeavor as early as possible to put them out of the way. [Hear, hear.] The question must be looked at soon, and solved in some way or other. [Cheers.]

Rev. Dr. Campbell, at the call of the meeting, supported the resolution, cordially indorsing the sentiments of the two previous speakers. He mentioned that he had received a letter from Mr. Thomson, of New-York, in which it was said of Dr. Cheever, "Our Bonaerger is among you; give him a grand reception." If to-night they had not given Dr.

Cheever a "grand" reception to begin with, they would at least give him a cordial and sincere one. [Cheers.]

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Dr. Cheever ascended the pulpit, and proceeded to deliver a very lengthened and able address. He said he was so unaccustomed in the great conflict against the iniquity of Slavery to the language of sympathy and kindness, encouragement and applause, that he hardly knew how to acknowledge the great and delightful heartiness of his reception. To the friends of the enslaved the privilege was given of suffering for Christ's sake, and up to the very eve of the abolition of Slavery, that would perhaps be the result of earnest and persistent labor in the cause. He had come from the midst of opposition and slander, and the wrath and calumny poured upon himself and church had followed him across the Atlantic. Through reproach and suffering God had trained and disciplined an Abolition Church in the very heart of a city almost wholly under the dominion of the slave power, and kept it faithful. They had hardly begun in earnest, when they were in the midst of a thunder-storm, so deep that it was easiest to plunge through it and come out on the other side. In each advance they had made they had suffered a great, numerical and pecuniary loss, but it had been beaten into still more unflinching resolution and firmness in contending against the great sin, and at whatever cost in the loss of wealthy supporters, they were determined to maintain a free and unfettered pulpit. [Hear, hear.] The life and forces of a country expanded in two directions—its religion and its laws. When any evil was enshrined and protected by both these authorities, its endurance was sure to be for ages. A more evil might be borne with patience and left to time for gradual amelioration. But when not merely a burden, but a sin was laid upon men's shoulders and held there by religion and law, there arose the necessity and obligation of incessant protest, disobedience and moral resistance, and every one who did not so act was a voluntary party to the guilt. That was the radicalism of himself and church, and they believed that no iniquity could stand before a people acting under such convictions. Just in proportion to the strength of the strongholds of the sin was the obligation of attacking them. If they were silent the fires of the Gospel would be put out, and then like a disabled steamship in which the water had risen so high as to put out the fires in the furnaces and destroy all possibility of salvation by working either the pump or the ship, they must go down. [Cheers.] There was no safety for them but in God's Word. They could go into fight with no other weapons, and there was no hope until the rank and file of God's militia in the Church closed up, and, like the Duke's Guards, stood firm, and, when the word came, launched themselves like a thunderbolt against the enemy. The people of this country had no idea of the debauching, devastating, uncontrollable sway of Slavery in the States. Their great work in America now was to rouse the Church and ministry, armed with the thunders and the lightnings of God's word, against the iniquity—complicated as it was in so many shapes and forms that it was scarcely possible even to indicate them within any reasonable length of time, that might be allotted to him. [Cheers.] In this conflict [continued Dr. Cheever] the Churches of Great Britain must assist us in the uncompromising application of the word of God. There are two phases that have done good service, from two great masters in your country—the one of fervid and practical piety, the other of philosophy, law and practical statesmanship—phases that have out, as with the sweep of a two-edged sword: the one phase from John Wesley as to the practical diabolism of the system of Slavery, that it is "the sum of all villainies;" and the other from Lord Brougham, reproaching "the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man." Is it not wonderful that at this day, under the light of Christianity, 1860 years after the birth of Christ, a crime execrated by the Divine law under the penalty of death, along with that of murder, should have been rescued from that criminal fellowship and revived under the Gospel, into Christian communion, as if it were a virtue! Was there ever a more malignant and extraordinary hallucination? The Church in which it continues, remain in the favor of God? [Hear, hear.] A crime gibbeted by the law of God is taken by Christian surgeons from the gallows, is exhumed by gospel resurrectionists, galvanized into a hideous life, and set among the living guests at the sacramental feast as a suitable companion with faith, hope and charity. [Loud applause.] And those who undertake to thrust the torch of God's flaming law within the skeleton, and to drag it forth beneath the condemnation of the Gospel, are themselves assaulted and denounced as being greater sinners and infidels than those who, in the very church of God, practice and make profit of the iniquity. [Cheers.] I say it is an unparalleled madness. [Cheers.] The reverend doctor concluded by a statement of the ineffectual attempt which had been made to remove him from his church by taking its control out of the hands of its members, and resumed his seat amidst loud applause.

Mr. W. H. Day, a colored gentleman from Canada, moved a resolution to the effect that this meeting would employ all its energies for the removal of Slavery and the Slave-trade, and especially for the removal of all disabilities to which any people of color are subjected in any part of the British dominions. After dwelling upon the general subject of Slavery in the United States, the speaker illustrated the prejudice of color that pervades even the

Christian church by the relation of several facts. One had reference to a young lady of color who, while in England, was a member of Baptist Noel's church, and was supported by the Earl of Shaftesbury. When she returned to America she was admitted to a Baptist church at Rhode Island, and received the sacrament in the morning, but was told in the evening that she could only sit in the negroes' pew, up stairs. A British officer's widow and daughter, hearing of this treatment, took the young lady into their pew the next Sunday, upon which the trustees of the chapel wrote to the English lady and informed her that if this conduct was repeated, she must forfeit her seat. To her honor she persisted, and was excluded from her seat in the church. Mr. Day also mentioned many of the social disabilities that prevailed in Canada against the people of color, and alluded to a rumor that he had heard, of a negro pew having been tolerated by the Colonial Missionary Society in one of the chapels in British Columbia.

Other speeches were made by gentlemen and reverend gentlemen present, and the resolutions were passed unanimously.

THE EXCITEMENT IN TEXAS.

MORE NEGROES ARRESTED—WHITE MEN DRIVEN FROM THE STATE.

The Austin, Texas, correspondent of the *Galveston News*, writing on the 2d, says:

"At a meeting of the Council in this city, the day before yesterday, it was decided to make a general search of the negro quarters, and a Committee of Investigation was accordingly appointed. One keg of powder, a large quantity of bullets, lead, muskets, caps and bowie-knives were found distributed at several places. The negroes implicated in the conspiracy belong to Messrs. Edward Clark, (our present Lieutenant Governor,) Sam Harris and Mrs. Beal. The investigation is still going on, and it is supposed that the leaders, who were doubtless white men, have fled from this city. Those who for some time past have been advocating the dignity of white labor and submission to the Black Republican Party, are, in our opinion, very much to blame. The slaves have been told that there was a candidate for President in the field who, if elected, would free them. They have been assured that the majority of the people were opposed to Slavery; and with emissaries from the North, actively at work among us, no wonder that a few ignorant and misled negroes have been induced to resort to arms."

The *Houston Telegraph* states that much excitement was running in Montgomery County, on the 3d and 5th, by the arrest of one Simmons, a white man, who, according to the statements of several negroes had offered to supply them with arms. A Vigilance Committee had been appointed to investigate the affair, and several slaves who had been examined separately before it, confessed that they had formed a conspiracy to murder Col. Shannon, a resident of Montgomery, set fire to his barns and houses, and make their escape. Simmons had assisted them in perfecting their plans. It had not been determined what disposition to make of him.

One Williamson, who had been suspected of tampering with negroes at the Navasota Depot, had been ordered to leave the State via Galveston.

The New-Orleans papers of the 10th speak of a suspicious character who had just passed through that city from Galveston, en route for the North. He managed to escape suspicion by disguising himself in woman's clothes. Before his true character was ascertained, he had left the city.

The excitement regarding the supposed conspiracy continued throughout Texas.

(BY TELEGRAPH.)

WASHINGTON, Friday, Aug. 17.

According to Texas news in the New Orleans papers of Tuesday last, the excitement in relation to the abolition conspiracy in that State appears to be on the increase.

A young man had been hung for giving strychnine to the slaves to put into the wells.

Another preacher had also been hung for being an active Abolitionist, while two other persons were similarly treated for inciting the slaves to insurrection.

These events had taken place in different parts of the State.

Frequent attempts at poisoning and incendiarism were reported.

Although the town of Henderson had nearly been consumed by fire, the people appeared unwilling to put faith in the reported conspiracy.

WEST INDIA EMANCIPATION.

LETTER FROM HON. CHARLES SUMNER.

The First of August was celebrated by the colored people throughout the Northern States as the Anniversary of Emancipation in the West Indies. Hon. Charles Sumner sent the following letter in reply to an invitation to attend a gathering at Abington, Mass.:

Boston, Monday, July 30, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR: If I forego the opportunity which you offer me of uniting with the earnest Abolitionists of Massachusetts in celebrating the Anniversary of British Emanci-

pation, I pray you not to believe me insensible to the magnanimous teachings of that day—destined, I doubt not, as men advance in virtue, to take its place still more and more among the great days of history.

Nothing shows the desperate mendacity of the partisans of Slavery more than the unfounded persistence with which they call this act "a failure." If it be a failure, then is virtue a failure; then is justice a failure; then is humanity a failure; then is God himself a failure; for virtue, justice, humanity, and God himself are all represented in this act.

Well proved facts vindicate completely the policy of Emancipation, even if it were not commanded by the simplest rules of morality. All testimony, whether from official documents or from travelers, shows beyond question that in all these islands the condition of the negro has been improved by emancipation; but the testimony is especially instructive when we learn that this improvement is most strongly manifest in those who have been born in freedom. Ask any person familiar with these islands—as I have often done—or consult any unprejudiced authority, and this will be the answer. This alone is enough to vindicate this act. Surely it is enough if men are raised in the scale of being, even though sugar perishes from the earth.

But careful statistics attest that the material interests of these possessions have shared the improvement of the population. In some of the islands, as in Barbadoes and Antigua, the advance is positive, while in Jamaica itself, which is the instance most constantly cited of "failure," the evidence is unanswerable that the derangement of affairs cannot be charged upon Emancipation, but is a natural incident to the anomalous condition of that Island throughout its history, aggravated by the insane pretensions of the slave-masters. Two different Governors of this Island have assured me that, with all their experience there, they looked upon Emancipation as a "blessing." Thus is it shown that the true policy of the world is found in justice. Nothing is truer than that injustice, besides its essential wickedness, is folly also. The unjust man is a fool.

Only recently, important testimony on this subject has found a place—where it would hardly be expected—in the columns of the New-York Times, and similar testimony occurs in other quarters, both in England and America. And yet with the truth flashing in their faces, our slave masters misrepresent this sublime and beautiful act as "a failure." This, however, is of a piece with their whole conduct.

Let me thank you for the invitation with which you have honored me, and for the good wishes with which you cheer me, and believe me, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours.

CHARLES SUMNER.

EUROPE.

By the *North American* from Liverpool the 8th and from Londonderry the 10th.

GARIBALDI was reported to be still at Messina preparing his expedition against the mainland—the report of his having already landed in Calabria proving untrue. It is probable, however, that some of his forces had landed. Gen. Lamorciere had suppressed a demonstration in favor of Garibaldi at Lodi, had taken the leaders prisoners, and had levied a war contribution of 44,000 crowns. An expedition from Piedmont, destined for the Roman States, was said to have been arrested by Farina, though a letter from Rome asserts that 15,000 Piedmontese had landed at San Stefano.

FRANCE.

The Emperor, after reviewing the troops destined for Syria, addressed them as follows:

"SOLDIERS: You leave for Syria. France hails with joy an expedition, the sole aim of which is to cause the rights of justice and humanity to triumph. You do not go to make war against a foreign nation, but to assist the Sultan in bringing back to obedience his subjects, who are blinded by the fanaticism of the former century. In that district you have great reminiscences. Fulfill your duty; show yourselves worthy to be the children of those who once gloriously carried into that country the banner of Christ. You do not leave in great numbers, but your courage and prestige are a supply to the deficiency; because whenever the French flag is seen to pass, the nations know that a great cause precedes it, and great people follow it."

The Emperor has given 200,000 francs in aid of the fugitives from Syria.

The semi-official correspondent is inclined to think the interview between the Emperor and the Queen of Spain, which has been spoken of, will not take place.

The Bourse is quiet. Rents closed on the 8th rather lower.—f.68.15c.

Prince William, of Baden, was on a visit to Chalons Camp, and would be present at the great military manoeuvres.

SYRIA.

The latest dates from Damascus report all quiet there, but murders were still committed in the surrounding country.

Thirty thousand Christian women were sold at twenty-five piasters each, and were detained in harems.

The *Beaufort* sailed from Marseilles on the 9th with 1,000 men for Syria.

* The civilized and christian world should know that a vastly greater number of Christian women in America are in a similar or worse condition.

CHINA AND THE WEST.

We have advices from China to the 15th inst. One thing only is clear in the chaos of uncertain intelligence which reaches us by this arrival, and that is the more than moral certainty that the Chinese authorities have prepared themselves for a vigorous defence of the Peiho forts and of the road to Peking. The rumors of last year, which filled the Taku forts with gray-capped Russians, have given place now to stories of Chinese astuteness and capacity, and to pictures of the preparation which China is making to repel by force of arms the insolent assumption of the Western Powers. It seems to be commonly conceded that the forts of the Peiho have been well and sagaciously armed since the attack of last year, and that the Chinese troops, having once "smelt powder" in actual warfare with Western forces, are not to be despised as combatants in the now impending strife. They have at least learned that if British and French balls carry death with them, Chinese balls, when equally well-aimed, may be equally trusted to disturb and disorganize hostile ranks. When we consider that the Chinese population number more than three hundred millions, and that Europe itself with America, is no more safe from a military movement of this colossal mass than the Roman Empire was from the awakened energies of the Germanic barbarians, it is easy to see that the Chinese war, of 1860, may possibly take its place among the great secular convulsions which have changed the face of human history.—*Times*.

At a quarterly meeting of the Worcester County (South Division) Anti Slavery Society, at Washburn Hall in Worcester, Aug. 12, the following Resolution, among others, was adopted.

Resolved, That the hypocritical pretensions of some of the religious bodies and journals to anti-slavery—such as the Methodist Episcopal Church, the so-called Church Anti-Slavery Society, the American Missionary Association, the Boston American Tract Society, and the New York Independent—are even more to be dreaded than the open spite of the older but scarcely more guilty ecclesiastical organizations; and we would exhort all truly anti-slavery men and women, who have been beguiled by or into them, to abandon connections, as among the last strongholds and bulwarks of slavery.

We should like to know why the American Missionary Association, and the Church Anti-Slavery Society, are placed in the same category with the M. E. Church, the Independent, &c.?

Family Miscellany.

For "The Principia."

LOVE IS OF GOD.

1 John iv. 7-8.

Beloved, let our mutual love,
Forevermore remain,
'Till on the shining shores above,
We all shall meet again.
For he that loves is born of God,
And Heaven and God doth know
Beneath his foot the world hath trod,
And overcome the foe.

Love is of God, and he alone
That loves, can be his child,
Only in love, is Jesus known,
The Father reconciled.
Through love our parentage we show,
Our heritage we prove;
For he that loves not, cannot know,
For God himself is love.
Then let our mutual love abide,
Abounding more and more;
'Till gathered by our Saviour's side,
We sing the conflict o'er.

W. G.

THE SAME GOOD GOD MAKES THE THUNDER.

A lovely little girl, not quite six years old, was out, taking a ride with her uncle and aunt, one summer afternoon, when her uncle noticed a black cloud rising. He turned the horse about, and made all possible haste to reach home before the shower overtook them, but they were some miles away,—the cloud came up very fast, and at length burst upon them.

As no other shelter was at hand, they were obliged to remain in the carriage and ride on. The rain came down in torrents, the lightning seemed to grow brighter, and the thunder louder every moment. Suddenly there was a dazzling flash, and almost at the same instant a peal of thunder like the explosion of a cannon just above them.

The little girl's uncle leanned forward, and looking into her face, saw a smile there. "Are you not afraid, Nellie?" said he.

"Why, no indeed!" answered Nellie; "mother says the same good God that makes the flowers grow makes the thun-

der too, and he loves me just as well now as when the sun shines."—*Child at Home.*

CAUSES AND CURE OF POVERTY.

Plain hints, from a plain man, to plain people in general.

CHAPTER I.—CONSIDERATION.

There is scarcely anything that people dread more than they do *poverty*. But, at the same time, there is scarcely anything, *except sin*, that a large class of people take so little care to prevent or to cure.

On this subject, as on most others, the grand difficulty is *thoughtlessness, inconsideration*. The "people do not consider." Consequently they do not *know*: and not knowing, they fail to *do* what is necessary, to avoid poverty.

Fix your eye upon any neighbor of your's, that is quietly and steadily "getting along in the world" supporting his family, laying up a little, week after week, month after month, and year after year, while many others who began life under similar circumstances and advantages, are laying up nothing, hardly making both ends of the year meet, and, perhaps, running behind hand, getting into debt, and growing poorer and poorer, every year.

What is the cause of this difference? Many things, doubtless, may be truthfully said, in answer to this question. I intend, before I have done writing about it, to mention quite a number of these things. But there is one thing that I must insist upon, in the first place, because it lies at the bottom of all the *other* things, and is the cause of them all.

The first great difference is this. The man that steadily lays up a little, and gains ahead, differs from those who run behind hand, in this one thing—*CONSIDERATION*. He thinks what he is about. They do *not*. He does everything by a rule, and by a plan which he has considered, and has determined to follow. They think nothing about it. They have no fixed rules. They have no plan. They do just what comes into their heads, for the time being. They go in one direction to-day, and in another direction to-morrow, changing as often as the winds, without knowing why or wherefore.

Or, if they have any plans, they are not *well considered* plans. They are adopted without proper consideration, without thinking of both sides, and all sides of the question, without properly comparing one plan with another, and judging wisely, which is the best. It is not enough to have a plan. It must be a good plan. It is not enough even to have a good plan. You ought to have the *best* plan, if you can find it. And there is no way to get the best plan, nor even a good plan, without steady, patient, habitual *thinking*.

The first thing, then, in the economy of human life, is to be a good *thinker*. If a man is not a good thinker, he cannot be a good *planner*. And, if he is not a good planner, he cannot be a good *worker*. Nay, he may work himself to death, and die of old age at five and forty; may live uncomfortably, die poor, and leave his family in destitution; and all for the want of proper consideration, or thinking. Working well, and thinking well, belong together, and must not be divorced.

INTO THE SUNSHINE.

"I wish father would come home."

The voice that said this had a troubled tone, and the face that looked up was sad.

"Your father will be very angry," said an aunt, who was sitting in the room with a book in her hand. The boy raised himself from the sofa, where he had been lying in tears for half an hour, and with a touch of indignation in his voice, answered:

"He'll be sorry, not angry. Father never gets angry."

For a few moments the aunt looked at the boy half curiously, and let her eyes fall again upon the book that was in her hand. The boy laid himself down upon the sofa again, and hid his face from sight.

"That's father, now!" He started up, after the lapse of nearly ten minutes, as the sound of a bell reached his ears, and went to the room door. He stood there for a little while, and then came slowly back, saying with a disappointed air:

"It is n't father. I wonder what keeps him so late. Oh, I wish he would come!"

"You seem anxious to get deeper into trouble," remarked the aunt, who had only been in the house for a week, and who was neither very amiable, nor very sympathizing towards children. The boy's fault had provoked her, and she considered him a fit subject for punishment.

"I believe, aunt Phebe, that you'd like to see me whipped!" said the boy, a little warmly. "But you won't."

"I must confess," replied aunt Phebe, "that I think a little wholesome discipline of the kind you speak of, would not be out of place. If you were my child, I am very sure you would n't escape."

"I'm not your child; I don't want to be. Father's good, and loves me."

"If your father is so good, and loves you so well, you must be a very ungrateful or a very inconsiderate boy. His goodness don't seem to have helped you much."

"Hush, will you!" ejaculated the boy, excited to anger by this unkindness of speech.

"Phebe!" It was the boy's mother who spoke now, for the first time. In an under tone, she added, "You are wrong. Richard is suffering quite enough, and you are doing him harm rather than good."

Again the bell rang, and again the boy left the sofa, and went to the sitting-room door.

"It's father!" and he went gliding down stairs.

"Ah, Richard!" was the kindly greeting, as Mr. Gordon took the hand of his boy. "But what's the matter, my son? You don't look happy."

"Won't you come in here?" And Richard drew his father into the library. Mr. Gordon sat down, still holding Richard's hand.

"You are in trouble, my son. What has happened?"

The eyes of Richard filled with tears as he looked into his father's face. He tried to answer, but his lips quivered. Then he turned away, and opening the door of a cabinet, brought out the fragments of a broken statuette, which had been sent home, only the day before, and set them on a table before his father, over whose countenance came instantly a shadow of regret.

"Who did this, my son?" was asked in an even voice.

"I did it."

"How?"

"I threw my ball in there, once—only once, in forgetfulness."

The poor boy's tones were husky and tremulous.

A little while Mr. Gordon sat, controlling himself, and collecting his disturbed thoughts. Then he said, cheerfully,—

"What is done, Richard, can't be helped. Put the broken pieces away. You have had trouble enough about it, I can see—and reproof enough for your thoughtlessness—so I shall not add a word to increase your pain."

"Oh, father!" And the boy threw his arms about his father's neck. "You are so kind, so good!"

Five minutes later, and Richard entered the sitting-room, with his father. Aunt Phebe looked up, for two shadowed faces; but did not see them. She was puzzled.

"That was very unfortunate," she said, a little while after Mr. Gordon came in. "It was such an exquisite work of art. It is hopelessly ruined."

Richard was leaning against his father when his aunt said this. Mr. Gordon only smiled, and drew his arms closely around his boy. Mrs. Gordon threw upon her sister a look of warning, but it was unheeded.

"I think Richard was a very naughty boy."

"We have settled all that, Phebe," was the mild but firm answer of Mr. Gordon; "and it is one of our rules to get into the sunshine as quick as possible."

Phebe was rebuked, while Richard looked grateful, and it may be, a little triumphant; for his aunt had borne down upon him rather too hard for a boy's patience to endure.

Into the sunshine as quickly as possible! Oh is not that the better philosophy for our homes? Is it not true Christian philosophy? It is selfishness that grows angry and repels, because a fault has been committed. Let us get the offender into the sunshine as quickly as possible, so that true thought and right feelings may grow vigorous in its warmth. We retain anger, not that anger may act as a wholesome discipline, but because we are unwilling to forgive. Ah, if we were always right with ourselves, we would oftener be right with our children.

From the Child at Home.

IF ONE LESSON WON'T DO, ANOTHER WILL.

"Mother," said Mary, "I can't make Henry put figures as I tell him."

"Be patient, my dear, and not speak so sharply."

"But he won't let me tell him how to put the figures, he does not know how to do it himself," said Mary, pettishly.

"Well, my dear, if Henry won't learn a lesson in figures, suppose you try to teach him one in *patience*. This is harder to teach, and harder to learn, than any lesson in figures, perhaps, when you have learned this, the other is easier to both of you."

Mary hung her head, for she felt that it was a shame any little girl to be fretted by such a little thing, or in any way; and she began to think that perhaps she served to be blamed as much as Henry.

Children very often feel like complaining of their parents, or brothers and sisters, when they are very much fault themselves. A fretful, impatient child, makes him and all about him very unhappy. Will you all try to learn a lesson of patience?

"A fretful temper will divide
The closest knot that can be tied."

DON'T BE SNAPPISH.—Some are like dogs, always showing their teeth; or like wasps, their stings. Be neither. Keep your temper down. Don't object to every thing your friend says. Don't contradict every body and every thing. A continual objector is a regular thorn in the sides of society. He is deficient in good breeding, and in humility in Christian love.—*Children's Friend.*

DANGEROUS ENEMIES.—People of small intellect are dangerous enemies, because they are likely to have few, franeous thoughts to divert them from their immediate object of malice; because they are shrewd noticers of peculiarities, and personal weaknesses; because there is no which a fool and a mean man enjoy so much as to catch wise and honest one at a disadvantage.

PEPPER AT CHURCH.—Dr. Hall recommends the use of pure cayenne pepper by persons who are drowsy in church while listening to long and uninteresting discourses. Wakefulness may be secured by having some spice or pepper put into the sermon?

THE ARTESIAN WELL at Columbus, Ohio, has already reached the unprecedented depth of twenty-four hundred feet, or nearly half a mile. It is the deepest well in the world but as yet discharges no water, nor exhibits any of it.

BEAUTIFUL was the reply of a venerable man to the question, whether he was still in the land of the living—but I am almost."

When salt water rises to the clouds, it loses its salt and becomes fresh and sweet; so with the human soul.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*:

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50. Postage 50 cts.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00 Postage 50 cts.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., 50 75. Postage 50 cts.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FOR THE MILLIONS.

- I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
- II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
- III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
- IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the powers of the State and National Governments. By W. GOODELL.

A summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal Opinions* collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. AN APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary Congress, &c.

Price, Single Copies, 12 cents; Per Dozen, One Dollar. Prepaid, 3 cents per copy.

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office *Principia*, 339 Pearl Street, New York. Terms, CASH.

THE ANALYST.

A weekly Family Paper, devoted to Temperance, Progress, Social Improvement, published by M. H. ALLARDT, 197 8th Street, Cleveland, O.—Send for Specimens.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 129 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.